HENRY M FEIEREISEN . PAGE 07/09

11/18/2004 17:10 2122442233

Docket No.: HERTINGER Appl. No.: 10/783,964

## REMARKS

The last Office Action of August 18, 2004 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 5, 7, and 13 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,880,956 to Graf in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,878,582 to Waled.

Claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graf and Waled in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,914,876 to Hiral.

Claims 1 and 9 have now been amended to recite that the "interpreter" receives from a user an instruction commensurate with a movement of an element, and translates the instruction into a machine code. In addition, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite that the display graphically displays to the user a simulated effect of the instruction in form of a two-dimensional or three-dimensional representation by highlighting the collision on the display and displaying in ASCII code the instruction causing the collision.

The Graf reference discloses a lead-through robot programming system with a workstation which provides a visual description of the nature of the collision. Col. 14, lines 5 to 9 states as follows: "If any collisions or near misses

2122442233 HENRY M FEIEREISEN PAGE 08/09

Docket No.: HERTINGER

11/18/2004 17:10

Appl. No.: 10/783,964

are identified, the software performing the collision checking function can

generate textual messages on the monitor 104 or other controller display (not

shown) describing the nature of the collisions". Thus, while Graf is able to

describe in general the nature of a collision, Graf fails to describe the actual

instruction causing the collision, let alone describing the instruction in ASCII

code.

The Waled reference discloses an interpreter that translates a computer

program into a real-time operating program for other corresponding control

devices, Waled does not suggest an interpreter that receives from a user an

instruction commensurate with a movement of an element, and translates the

instruction into a machine code, as set forth in amended claims 1 and 9.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither

Graf nor Waled, nor a combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of

the present invention, as recited in claims 1 and 9.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend

on claims 1 and 9, share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is

respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

With respect to the Hirai reference, applicant notes that Hirai merely

discloses (in the Abstract only) an interpreter for the expanded control words so

as to expand a processing program containing expanded control words into a

plurality of control programs. Hirai discloses an interpreter that translates

between programs, which is different from the interpreter recited in amended

claims 1 and 9.

7

PAGE 8/9 \* RCVD AT 11/18/2004 4:10:03 PM [Eastern Standard Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 \* DNIS:8729306 \* CSID:2122442233 \* DURATION (mm-ss):02-24

11/18/2004 17:10 2122442233 HENRY M FEIEREISEN PAGE 09/09

Docket No.: HERTINGER Appl. No.: 10/783,964

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Rv

Hency M. Feiereisen Agent For Applicant

Reg. No: 31,084

Date: November 18, 2004 350 Fifth Avenue Suite 4714 New York, N.Y. 10118

(212)244-5500 HMF:WS:af